

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 24 2006

REMARKSI. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated May 24, 2006, the claims have not been amended. Claims 1-39 remain in the application. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application is requested.

II. Prior Art Rejections

In paragraph (4) of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 8-15, 17, 21-28, 30, and 34-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Beezer et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,597,314) and Sandhu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,985,953).

Specifically, claims 1, 2, 4, 8-15, 17, 21-28, 30, and 34-39 were rejected as follows:

As to claim 1 as illustrated in Fig. 3, and as described (column 4, lines 55-63), Beezer discloses a computer-implemented 200 method for presenting a series of titles 310 (help source file) of a document to a user.

As per the step of "maintaining a help", the method of Beezer includes presenting (maintaining) a set of help topics or series of titles to be selected by a user (column 4, lines 55-63);

As per the step of "receiving request", the method of Beezer includes receiving a signal corresponding to a user request for the help and settings control document (column 9, lines 16-17 of claim 2).

As per the step of "obtaining a help", the method of Beezer includes determining (obtaining) the target part of the help and settings control document based on a navigational history associated with the user (column 6, lines 46-56, column 9, lines 6-10 of claim 1);

As per the step of "displaying", the method of Beezer further includes displaying a configured (customized) display of the help and settings control document (help source file) based on stored navigational history component 704 and user profile component 708 (column 7, lines 53-column 8, lines 22).

Beezer, however, does not teach, "the help history file comprises a cookie, generated by the local computer, wherein an identification for each previously opened file is stored in the cookie." Sandhu, on the other hand, is directed to methods and system for creating secure cookies (Abstract). The methods can be used to create, receive, and transmit secure cookies, confidential cookies, and authentication cookies (Abstract). Sandhu further discloses cookies contain strings of text characters encoding relevant information about the user. Cookies can store any type of conforming client data including, e.g., the name of cookie (i.e. Cookie_Name) and the actual information that is kept in the cookie (i.e. Cookie_Value), IP address, password, etc. (see Cookies Specification, col. 4, lines 25-63). Thus, by assigning a name, any name, such as, 'user's interaction histories' or "the help history file", to Cookie_Name, individual user's rerecords (e.g., navigational records, Id, etc) can be stored under Cookie_Value. Sandhu further discloses that cookies are generated not only at a remote server, cookies can also be generated at a local computer, e.g., Alic's machine (local machine) generates the cookie (col. 8, lines 15-62). Thus, the locally generated cookies (i.e. under any assigned name) can store pointers to individual user records to identify who they are and what they are up to (e.g., interaction history). When alic, access her machine for the next time, she will be identified and receive a customized (such as a previously selected link will be highlighted, etc).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the cookie of Sandhu for the pointer of Beezer because the help document of Beezer will be able to identify the user and matches user's activity when a user logs for the second time, i.e., the user does not have to retype the previously entered information.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Beezer and Sandhu to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

As to claim 14, Beezer in view of Sandhu discloses a computer-implemented help system reciting all the limitations of these claims in system form (e.g., see Beezer, claim 1). Thus, since these claims correspond generally to method claims 1, 2, 4, 9-13, respectively, and recite similar features in System form, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 27, Beezer in view of Sandhu discloses a computer-readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions for performing a method of providing a user access to help and settings control document (e.g., see Beezer, claim 5). Thus, since these claims correspond generally to method claims 1, 2, 4, 9-13, respectively, and recite similar features in Storage form, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Applicant traverses the above rejections for one or more of the following reasons:

- (1) Neither Beezer nor Sandhu teach, disclose or suggest the processing of all of the method steps on a local computer;
- (2) Neither Beezer nor Sandhu disclose or suggest a help history file that is stored in a cookie, wherein the cookie is generated by the local computer; and
- (3) Neither Beezer nor Sandhu teach, disclose or suggest the storage of an identification for each previously opened help file in a cookie.

Independent claims 1, 14, and 27 are generally directed to displaying a customized presentation of one or more help files on a local computer. Specifically, after receiving a request for a help file on the local computer, a help history file is obtained from the local computer. The help history file has a number of specific attributes. For example, the help history file stores information relating to a usage of the help system. To store this information, the help history file comprises a cookie that is generated on the local computer, and each time a help file is opened an identification for the opened help file is stored in the cookie. Thus, the cookie stores the user's current location within a help system and a history of which help files the user has opened.

In rejecting the claims, the Action primarily relies on Beezer. Beezer merely describes a method and apparatus for providing user access to help and settings control in a system for viewing electronic books includes single document integrating help features and settings controls may be accessed in a single-window or single page viewing environment. The help and settings document may be accessed from a number of different contexts, including a library page or from within a

book. "Smart" navigational features are provided for predicting a part, section or chapter of the help and settings document that is sought by a user based on navigational history and user profiles. Feedback as to the accuracy of predictions made by the "smart" navigation is also provided. However, Beezer lacks any discussion about cookies and identification for opened help files being stored in cookies. Instead, Beezer teaches away from Applicant's invention because it specifically describes the use of pointers to determine which part, section or chapter a user navigates to (see col. 7, lines 21-24). In fact, the Office Action admits the lack of Beezer's teaching with respect to cookies, and relies on Sandhu to teach these claim elements.

To teach the various claim elements, the Office Action relies on Sandhu's Abstract, col. 4, lines 25-63 and col. 8, lines 15-62. Col. 4, lines 25-63 provides:

2.1 Cookie Specifications

Although there are many ways to use cookies on the Web, the basic process and the contents of cookies are based on the following description. FIG. 1 shows an example of cookies.

To create a cookie for a Web site, the server sends a Set-cookie header line as follows after a browser requests a URL access to the site:

SET-Cookie: Cookie_Name=Cookie_Value; expire=Date; domain=Domain_Name;
path=Path; Secure_Flag=boolean; Flag=boolean

Cookie_Name and Cookie_Value have the actual information we want to keep in the cookie. We can have multiple Cookie_Name and Cookie_Value pairs in a cookie which appears as one to the browser.

Date is the valid lifetime of the cookie. By default, the cookie is set to expire when the browser is closed. If the expiration date is set, the cookie will no longer be stored when the expiration date has been reached.

Domain_Name is a host or domain name where the cookie is valid. When a server is looking for the cookies for a particular Web site, a comparison of the Domain_Name is made with the actual Internet domain name of the host. For instance, this field could have domain=acme.com as a domain name.

Flag specifies whether or not all machines within a given domain can access the variable in the cookie. If true all servers in the specified Domain_Name can use the cookie (and the browser will supply the cookie to all servers in that domain). If false Domain_Name is interpreted as a host name, which is the only host to whom the browser will give that cookie.

Path sets the valid path at the domain for the cookie. The most general path is "/". For instance, the path "/foo" would match "/foodoc" and "/foo/index.html". If a cookie is specified "secure", the cookie will only be transmitted over secure communications channels such as SSL [WS96] connection.

Co. 8, lines 25-63 provides:

When Alice later needs to access a remote server (say Bob), Alice connects to the KDC with the TGT_Cookie, along with the TSK_Cookie, which is generated by Alice's machine to carry an authenticator ({timestamp}S_A) and the name of the remote server, Bob. The KDC verifies the timestamp and decrypts the TGT to discover S_A. Then, the KDC creates both the Kerberos client cookie, KC_Cookie, containing {K_{Cs}, Bob} S_A for Alice and the Kerberos ticket cookie, KT_Cookie, containing T_{Cs} (encrypted with Bob's secret key) for Bob. As a result, the KDC sends Alice {K_{Cs}, Bob} S_A and T_{Cs} separately.

According to the original Kerberos protocol, the KDC is supposed to encrypt those values all together and send $\{K_{cs}, T_{cs}, \text{Bob}\}_{SA}$ to Alice in one cookie. However, this approach gives us a limitation for using the KT_Cookie with other secure cookies. For instance, if we need to use a KT_Cookies with regular cookies in FIG. 1 for authentication, we may also consider about the integrity of the cookies which can be supported by another secure cookie, Seal_Cookie (described in section 3.2). By the original Kerberos protocol, users must change the contents of the cookie or generate another cookie to make a cookie which has the ticket to Bob (T_{cs}). This obviously conflicts with the integrity of the cookies. Therefore, the KDC is required to create two separate cookies (KC_Cookie and KT_Cookie) and send them to Alice.

When Alice connects to Bob, the KT_Cookie and the TSS_Cookie, which is generated by Alice's machine containing an authenticator ($\{\text{timestamp}\}_{K_{cs}}$) are sent by Alice to Bob. To provide mutual authentication, Bob responds to the authenticator. Now, Alice believes that she is connecting to Bob, since Bob was able to decrypt the ticket in the KT_Cookie, which meant he knew K_{cs} encrypted with K_s .

3.1.4 Digital-Signature-Based Authentication

If servers know users' public keys, the digital signature technologies such as DSA [Fed91] and RSA [RSA78] can be used to authenticate users with cookies. To use this method, the user needs additional browser software to generate a cookie which contains a signed timestamp. For instance, when Alice needs to access a remote server (say, Bob), who knows Alice's public key, Alice's machine generates a timestamp and creates the Sign_Cookie shown in FIG. 2, which has Alice's digital signature (signed with her private key) on the timestamp. When Alice connects to Bob, he receives the Sign_Cookie from Alice and verifies the signature with her public key.¹⁰

As can be seen above, col. 4, lines 25-63 merely describes the ability for a server to set a cookie for a website. When a browser requests a web site, the server sends a set_cookie command in response that provides various parameters. The server specified parameters include a cookie name and cookie value pair, a date (for the valid lifetime of the cookie), a domain name (for the location where the cookie is valid), a flag (that provides whether all machines at a given domain can access the cookie), and a path (for a valid path at the domain for the cookie). However, contrary to that asserted in the Office Action, such language does not even remotely refer to a help file nor to an identification for each previously opened help file. Further, such a cookie is only generated by the server and is NOT generated by the local computer.

As can be seen above, col. 8, lines 25-63 merely describes the use of Kerberos with cookies (see col. 7, line 50-col. 8, line 15). The description provides the process for Alice to access a remote server by connecting to a key distribution center (KDC). Alice connects to the KDC using a TGT_Cookie. A TGT_Cookie is a ticket granting ticket cookie. The value in the TGT_Cookie is replaced with authenticators (see col. 7, line 50-col. 8, line 15). In addition, it is noted that the user or Alice is required to have additional browser software to replace the value of the cookie (see co. 7, lines 57-65). The TSK_Cookie is a timestamp cookie wherein

TSK_Cookie-{timestamp}_{SA}, Alice, Bob

See Fig. 3.

Thus, any cookies generated on Alice's machine are exclusively related to Kerberos and authentication as can be clearly seen throughout the description. In this regard, contrary to that asserted, such cookies cannot have identification set such as those set forth in the present claim limitations. Instead, Sandhu does not even remotely describe, explicitly or implicitly, the local generation or use of cookies set forth in the claims. Contrary to that asserted in the Office Action, Sandhu does not teach, disclose, suggest, or even remotely hint at the storage of pointers to individual user records to identify who they are and what they are up to. Such an assertion has no foundation in Sandhu. In fact, the Office Action fails to recite any portion of Sandhu that teaches or hints at such a suggestion. In this regard, the Office Action is clearly in error and fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

The Office Action continues and provides that "When Alice, access her machine the next time, she will be identified and receive a customized (such as a previously selected link will be highlighted, etc)." Such an assertion is not based on any portion of Sandhu and is a illogical leap from Sandhu's teaching.

Again, Sandhu fails to teach the claim elements in numerous regards. Firstly, the claims specifically provide that an identification for each previously opened help file is stored in the cookie. Sandhu does not disclose or even reference any such identification whatsoever. In this regard, Sandhu merely provides for the use of authentication and the storage of key values. Accordingly, the specific claim limitations are not even remotely hinted at in Sandhu.

In addition to the lack of teaching the identification, Sandhu also fails to describe that such a cookie having identifications is generated by the local computer. In this regard, Sandhu describes the use of cookies as commonly used viz a viz server generation and storage of a cookie (sec col. 4, lines 25-63) followed by the description of Kerberos based authentication using cookies for mutual authentication. In this regard, there is nothing in Sandhu that hints or alludes to a use of a cookie to obtain content other than in the well-known use of a cookie.

While Applicant acknowledges that one cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references, the claimed invention must also be examined as a whole and whether the "whole" claimed invention would have

been obvious at the time of invention (see MPEP §2142). Viewing the present invention as a whole provides for not only generating a cookie locally by the client computer but also providing that the information stored in the local computer is generated and obtained locally. In this regard, the help history file is obtained from the local computer. Further, the history file contains information relating to the help files used/viewed by the user. Such a teaching is not described, suggested, or hinted at by any of the cited references, either alone, or in combination.

Again, the concept of the present invention as claimed provides for a local help system (and not a web or Internet based help system), wherein the use of the help system is monitored by creating a help history file. The help history file is comprised of a cookie that is generated locally and contains an identification for each previously opened help file. Such a teaching is completely lacking from all of the cited references. The references either teach the use of a cookie in a network/online based environment wherein info relating to web sites accessed are stored or for Kerberos based authentication. However, none of the references are used in the specific manner set forth in the independent claims.

Moreover, the various elements of Applicant's claimed invention together provide operational advantages over Beezer and Sandhu. In addition, Applicant's invention solves problems not recognized by Beezer or Sandhu.

Applicants further submit that the above arguments also apply to the prior art made of record but not relied upon in the rejection (e.g., as set forth in the Conclusion of the Office Action).

Thus, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 14, and 27 are allowable over Beezer and Sandhu. Further, dependent claims 2-13, 15-26, and 28-39 are submitted to be allowable over Beezer and Sandhu in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 14, and 27, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 2-13, 15-26, and 28-39 recite additional novel elements not shown by Beezer and Sandhu.

III. Requirement for Information

On page 9 of the Office Action, a requirement for information was issued relating to the art cited on page 3 of the declaration previously submitted. Enclosed is a copy of page 3 with the publications listed in non-redacted form. Applicants note that all art originally identified on page 3

was previously cited in the Information Disclosure Statement that was submitted by Applicant on January 13, 2002. Such art was considered by the Examiner as indicated by the initials on the PTO Form 1449 mailed with the Office Action of April 7, 2004.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the Requirement for Information has been complied with.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: August 24, 2006

By: 
Name: Jason S. Feldmar
Reg. No.: 39,187

JSF/

G&C 30571.263-US-01

SVL8-2001-0027 Method and apparatus for tracking usage of HTML-based online help systems - continued

help, and store the information within the application or in a database. HTML-based help does not address user customisation.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

By using JavaScript instead of CGI scripts or Java servlets, this proposal removes the need for a Web server, which might otherwise be required to implement dynamic user customisation of HTML help. Java applets are not appropriate because they cannot maintain state without writing to a cookie file, and in this case, JavaScript is still required. Advanced AI-like function, however, could be provided by a Java applet that interacts with the JavaScript.

4. If the invention is implemented in a product or prototype, include technical details, purpose, disclosure details to others and the date of that implementation.

N/A

Critical Questions (Questions 1-9 must be answered in English)**Question 1**

On what date was the invention workable? [REDACTED] Please format the date as MM/DD/YYYY (Workable means i.e. when you know that your design will solve the problem)

***Question 2**

Is there any planned or actual publication or disclosure of your invention to anyone outside IBM?

☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, Enter the name of each publication or patent and the date published below.

Publication/Patent

Date Published or Issued:

Are you aware of any publications, products or patents that relate to this invention?

☒ Yes
☐ No

If yes, Enter the name of each publication or patent and the date published below.

Publication/Patent US4800485 On-line documentation facility

Date Published or Issued Jan 24, 1989

Publication/Patent US4964077:Method for automatically adjusting help information displayed in an online interactive system

Date Published or Issued Oct 16, 1990

Publication/Patent US5513308:Device and method for determining a series of operations for interactive assistance

Date Published or Issued April 30, 1996

Publication/Patent US5535323:Method of and system for displaying context sensitive and application independent help information

Date Published or Issued July 9, 1996

***Question 3**

Has the subject matter of the invention or a product incorporating the invention been sold, used internally in manufacturing, announced for sale, or included in a proposal?

☐ Yes
☒ No

Is a sale, use in manufacturing, product announcement, or proposal planned?

☐ Yes
☒ No

If Yes, identify the product if known and indicate the date or planned date of sale, announcements, or proposal and to whom the sale, announcement or proposal has been or will be made.

Product

Version/Release

Code Name

Date

BEST AVAILABLE COPY